

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be amended as indicated in the accompanying amended page(s), in which:

- Claims 1, 2, 4 – 8, 11 – 16, 18, 21 – 26, 30, and 32 are cancelled; and
- Claims 3, 10, 19, 27 – 29, 33, and 34 are amended.

By this amendment, claims 3, 10, 19, 27 – 29, 33, and 34 are pending. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

- Remarks -

35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4 – 8, 11 – 16, 18, 21 – 26, 30, and 32 are cancelled from the present application, rendering moot the rejections thereof. Claims 3, 10, 19, 27 – 29, 33, and 34 remain pending for further prosecution.

Claims the remaining claims, claim 34 is independent. Claims 3, 10, 19, 27 – 29, and 33 are amended to depend from independent claim 34.

In the instant Office Action, independent claim 34 is rejected under §103(a) over the combination of Akira et al. (JP 2001-130090) and Brenner (US 6,206,593). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 34 as amended recites, *inter alia*, a paper exit slot from which paper exits and is exposed from the device. This paper exit slot, together with the paper feed mechanism and the printhead, define an effectively planar paper feed path through the printer.

The instant rejection acknowledge that Akira et al. do not disclose an arrangement where the paper exist slot, together with the paper feed mechanism and the printhead, define an effectively planar paper feed path through the printer. However, the instant rejection cites Brenner as allegedly disclosing this arrangement.

Applicant points out however that in Brenner, the exit slot from which paper exist and is exposed from the device corresponds to reference numeral 156 (see for example Fig. 11), and that this exit slot (156) does not define an effective planar paper feed path with the paper feed mechanism and the printhead. In fact, the exit slot (156) of Brenner, together with the paper feed mechanism 168 and printhead 169 define a U-shaped feed path, which is completely opposite to that of a planar feed path.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a combination of Brenner with Akira et al. does not arrive at the invention claimed in claim 34.

Moreover, claim 34 recites a curved paper guide for urging paper exiting from the exit slot towards a display side of the flat panel display. The instant rejection asserts that Brenner discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that Brenner in fact teaches away from this arrangement.

Applicant refers to Brenner at col. 7, lines 50 – 53, where it is stated that:

“In addition, because printed paper exists [sic] reward, it is protected from environmental conditions, such as food spatters when the computer 100 is used in a kitchen.”

Brenner therefore suggests that paper should exit away from the display side, rather than towards it, so as to protect the paper from environmental conditions.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully believes that claim 34, and the claims now dependent therefrom, are novel and inventive over the combination of Akira et al. and Brenner. The Examiner's further consideration of the application is respectfully sought, and Applicant looks forward to word of further official communication in due course.

Very respectfully,



Kia Silverbrook, Managing Director

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: pair@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762